groups working with local government administrators has more than doubled over the past 5 years. Uganda's successful development model also includes empowering women in government, in civil society and in enterprise development. The number of women in the governments rose from 22 percent to 45 percent in 4 years and a woman now serves as Vice President of Uganda.

Mr. Speaker, Uganda's record of achievement reflects good governance. President Museveni and his team have successfully transformed a war-torn and ethically divided country into one with strong democratic institutions. Uganda held successive elections in 1996 and 2001 that were certified as free and fair by national and international bodies. Additionally, the government has made the issue of multi-party system a transparent debate with the referendum in 2000 that was also certified as free and fair by the international community.

Voter turnout in Uganda is also admirable with the vast majority of eligible voters consistently turning out to vote. Uganda is now engaged in a national process to further refine its flourishing democracy.

While corruption continues to challenge Uganda, the government is making strides with the adoption of an aggressive anti-corruption strategy through the independent Office of the Inspector General. In partnership with the World Bank, Uganda instituted reforms to broaden the enforcement authority of the IGG and strengthen its ability to fight corruption. Public officials in Uganda must now among other things declare their wealth upon taking office and throughout the process of their holding office.

Mr. Speaker, Uganda's record speaks for itself. The Millennium Challenge Account should build on the African Growth and Opportunity Act. It should strengthen the capacity of progressive poor nations, such as Uganda, to realize further gains as they proceed on the arduous but promising path of reform and development.

AN ENERGY POLICY FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it is a great time, as we come together to speak tonight, things are going well, thank heavens, in Iraq and I think we will actually see a time and place in modern times when a country as strong as America is willing to go in and secure the freedom for other people. And so this is a time of great faith in America but it is also a time of problems. And, in fact, in Iraq in particular we see one of the side effects of that war has been a significant increase in the cost of oil and gas and energy for the people of America. So tonight 2 or 3 of us who are members of the Western Caucus would like to talk about energy policy in America and the need to pass the energy bill later this week.

A couple of things are important as we do that. In the first place, we need to protect the environment. That is essential. In the second place, we need to have a secure source of energy, and that needs to be largely domestic. And, finally, we need to have a reasonable price for ourselves and for future generations.

A little bit later I am going to talk about oil or gas exploration and development in America. I would like now to introduce a couple of my colleagues. I will start with the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) who will take a couple of minutes to talk about some of the big ideas here.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank my senior colleague from Utah.

Mr. Speaker, when we entered this body a couple of months ago I was a high school teacher. And I have to admit it is somewhat difficult trying to raise 5 kids on a high school teacher's salary. One of the things that was most significant, most difficult, was always dealing with those essential energy costs that were coming to us, the higher utility rates, increased gas, always seeming at the whim of foreign changes that took place, and always without a comprehensive energy policy that this country vitally needs.

Those costs were ever escalating. And it does not take a rocket scientist to figure out, if you would just look at the chart we have here and follow the green line which is simply gasoline prices or gasoline production versus the red line which is prices. And you simply know as the green line goes down, prices go up. Now the inverse would also be true. If we could increase the supply, the cost would also go down.

There are those who claim that there is no way we can possibly increase our energy source without totally destroying our environment. Mr. Speaker, I have to reject that failed philosophy of the past. It is possible for us to secure our environment. We all want to drink clean water, to breathe clean air, to secure the land. But we can secure our environment by relying on modern technology to also provide us with the energy source we need and a domestic energy source that we desperately need. And we can do so not by dealing with foreign powers, but on land that we presently own and control.

In a minute, Mr. Speaker, I think one of my colleagues will go into detail about the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge which has potential that is there on land that was put aside for that very purpose. A common sense approach for providing for our energy needs could be easily accomplished.

□ 2130

If we do nothing as a country, my bill worsens, my situation becomes more desperate. We can easily balance our political policy needs for energy with good environmentalism both for today and for tomorrow by simply putting politics aside and simply doing what is right to provide for my family, as well as for millions of people on a fixed income who need a stable and predictable domestic energy source, and if we reject what modern technology can do to provide that and provide for our environmental needs, we are moving this country's policy back 20 years.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman answer a question?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Of course, I would.

Mr. CANNON. As I look at this chart, the green line is not oil production in America. That green line is oil production that has come through the trans-Alaska pipeline. So this is essentially the Alaskan oil that has come into America, and yet even that relatively small portion of the oil we bring into America from Alaska through that pipeline has had a dramatic effect on the price of oil elsewhere, and that is because I think the markets are so tight that small fluctuations in our resources make a huge difference in that price. Is that what that chart is saying?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Utah is absolutely correct, and it clearly illustrates the potential we have to make life better for Americans if we just use what we have in a common-sense approach to a domestic energy policy.

Mr. CANNON. When people talk about the ANWR producing only a tiny fraction of the energy we need, what we are really saying is that a small fraction of the energy has a huge influence on the price we pay at the pump?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON), once again, is absolutely correct. It has a huge impact, and that small fraction is estimated somewhere in the neighborhood between 5 and 16 billion, with a B, barrels of recoverable oil.

Mr. CANNON. We have a chart later on that shows the various countries that produce oil that we bring into America and shows that that production in the new ANWR would actually be the second or third largest amount of oil we bring into America from any part of the world; is that not correct?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. It would be exactly right. It would make a major impact on the domestic future and stability of energy sources in America.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, if I got this right from the chart there, we add ANWR to the system and bring that oil into America and prices, instead of

spiking like the gentleman's red line shows there, prices tend to plummet like they have done as we have brought that oil from Alaska into the American market earlier?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. As I said, it does not take a rocket scientist to realize that is the way of protecting the future economic and energy needs of this country.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I was fortunate this weekend to visit the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, ANWR, with the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) and several Republican congressmen as well as our Democratic colleague, the gentlewoman from Guam (Mr. BORDALLO).

We began our visit by visiting the pristine environment in the southern Alaskan town of Valdez. Valdez is located at the southern end of the pipeline where wildlife and sea otters and clean crisp air and the oil shipping business co-exist in harmony.

This is not rhetoric from some Congressman who has never set foot on the site. This is firsthand knowledge seen with my own eyes that we can truly balance our energy needs and our desire to protect the environment without disturbing the ecosystem.

While in Valdez, we discussed suggested inferences that oil is seeping out of the pipelines and ruining the environment in great volumes. Let me say as a witness on the record that no such claims exist. In fact, if so much as a spoonful of oil or even brake fluid spills, an action report is filed, and there has been no such seepage at this site.

We toured the engine rooms and the facilities of the oil transfer stations, and we found the conditions to be spotless and clean. The new technology and equipment used for transporting oil, the professional mindsets of the employees and the operations of the energy development company have become so advanced that together they now serve as a guardian of the magnificent environment of Prince William Sound and the southern Alaskan town of Valdez.

We then flew from Valdez in the southern part of Alaska to the ANWR area, what they call the coastal plain, and we flew to the small Eskimo village of Kaktovik. It was almost 20 degrees below zero, and we were met there by over 200 people who turned out at their local community center for our field hearing. Everyone in attendance, except for a handful of non-Eskimos and one resident, was in favor of responsible energy development in their surrounding environment and on their lands.

We met with the elders who were represented by an 81-year-old man by the name of George Atookchook. He described for us how life was very harsh growing up. He grew up in an igloo where they would gather driftwood on the beaches before school, and they would make fire out of this driftwood, and they would burn whale oil for heat. This whale oil would fill the room with deadly smoke, and this deadly smoke led to a generation of Eskimos, particularly his father's generation, who lived on average only until their late forties.

During our hearing, the community leaders of Kaktovik taunted the extreme environmentalists. Let me quote the mayor of the north slope borough who said, We do not want to go back to our igloos, as some people want to see us. We want to grow by opening up ANWR.

The only people who live in or around ANWR want oil development. They believe, and I quote my 81-year-old friend, ''that man was put on this earth to use the land,'' to draw from its resources and to benefit.

The Americans out there listening tonight need to know that while the homelands of the people of Kaktovik have been returned, the extreme environmentalists will not allow them to use their natural resources that are beneath their feet.

While we fight to liberate Iraq from a brutal dictator, each passing day we become more dependent on foreign Middle East oil, and all the while, we have American oil located on the north slope of Alaska in an area inhabited by a wonderfully strong, native people who want to help us fulfill the energy needs of our Nation by using American oil in their backyard.

The people of Kaktovik told us that they need the economic gains that will help their people live longer, healthier lives, economic benefits to build classrooms where they can teach their little ones their native languages, to build museums to display their traditions and cultural heritage.

Mr. Chairman, domestic oil production also means more jobs for native American Eskimos and the entire Alaskan economy. New advancements in arctic frontier technology allows us to explore and develop oil with the highest environmental safeguards.

Within this energy bill, section 3 of H.R. 39 requires the Secretary to ensure, ''that oil and gas exploration, development, and production activities on the North Slope result in no significant adverse effect on fish and wildlife, their habitat, their sustaining resources and the environment.'' This highest standard of environmental protection is reiterated many times throughout this energy bill in H.R. 39.

Let us give the Eskimo village of Kaktovik what they want. Pass the energy bill. Return not just their land but the natural resources that are desperately needed to secure their future and ours.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI), everybody I have talked to who has ever visited the area has had pretty much the same response. I have not been up there. I understand it is a phenomenal visit, and it helps to understand exactly what we are doing and why this is a reasonable bill, especially when we put it in the context of the people that are there locally.

Mr. RENZI. Well said. One of the comments that was made to us was really how there have been a few people that have made it as far north as Anchorage, Alaska, but no one has taken the time to go all the way up to the arctic circle in the northernmost point of Alaska, the northernmost point of the United States of America, and hold a field hearing in a small Eskimo village.

These people, the Inupiat Eskimos, they are a very proud and strong people, and they are tired of telling Americans, telling politicians in Washington, telling eastern environmentalists what they want, only to have Congress not do their will. We are dealing with native American lands where they cannot even drill their own oil to sustain themselves. They cannot even go after it. We stop them.

We need to open up these lands. My colleague knows the issue well. It is well said.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I talked to many, many people about this, and to a man or woman on either the Democratic or Republican side, to the degree they have been there, their views are radically different from what they were before they were there. I think the gentleman expressed it very well.

I know the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) also had some comments for the gentleman.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I noticed on the chart there that the gentleman has the current Alaskan pipeline that is there. How far is that from the area we would be moving into to provide this new domestic security?

Mr. RENZI. I thank the gentleman from Utah for his question.

Americans invested their tax dollars in building a pipeline that runs almost 800 miles from the coastal plain in Prudhoe Bay all the way down to Valdez, millions and billions of dollars, jobs and the economy back in the 1970s when I graduated from high school. Many of my classmates went and worked on the pipeline. Some stayed because of the magnificent beauty of Alaska.

What we learned is that this pipeline at its highest production was producing about 2 million gallons or a little bit more. During the first Gulf War, under President Bush, we increased that to a little bit over 2 million because the production had fallen off to about 1.5 million barrels a day.

Right now, even though we are at war with Iraq, at maximum production we are only getting 1 million gallons a day, and that is because the reserves at Prudhoe Bay have fallen off, and yet to

answer the gentleman's question, 74 miles is all we need to go with a little step. All we have to do is build off of the existing pipeline in order to reach ANWR, and of that 74 miles, 30-some odd miles has already been completed. So we are talking about 30 or 40 miles of more pipeline that we need in order to use a billion dollar pipeline that is already in existence.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask this one final question. With the risk of being somewhat of a leading question, I think the gentleman very eloquently stated the position of the people who are there. I guess I would, once again, want to try and somehow if the gentleman could reiterate in his own mind that one of the problems we have had with our failed philosophy in the past that has produced so many problems is trying to have a Washington solution, one size fitting all.

Is the gentleman comfortable that the locals who know and understand the land, who know and love that environment, is the gentleman comfortable that they are positive that this is the appropriate thing that they want in their particular area and they know how to control it?

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the question.

We asked several of the city council members, current city council members, we asked several of the mayors from a local area, we asked the president of the student body of the high school, we asked all the villagers who were at the hearing, over 200 of them, what is the majority opinion, what do they feel. They said that, overwhelmingly, the people of this native American Eskimo village very much want to open it up.

The reason is because in the beginning, when the drilling was being done at Prudhoe Bay, there was a fear. They were unsure what kind of neighbors the oil companies would be. Since that time, technology and equipment and the good, hard work of all kinds of Americans, including their own people, who work on this pipeline have proven over the years that this is a worthy investment, and they are worthy of their trust. So these oil companies have been good neighbors, and they know that that will continue with some of the finest new technologies and some of the finest advancements in arctic technology and equipment to pull that oil out of the subsurface terrain.

What they know is they have good neighbors in the oil companies. What we do not know is how much oil really is under there, whether it be 6 billion gallons, whether it be 15 billion or even more. What we do know, though, is that our Nation needs it as a bridge to take us from our current dependency on oil to this new generation of alternative fuels.

We cannot just go to alternative fuels. That is so expensive right now, to think we are going to jump to the fuel cell or we are going to jump to hydrogen today. We need time to develop that technology, and the bridge from today until that day is that we use our American oil and not be so dependent on foreign oil.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from the neighboring State of Arizona for his insight into what the people of that particular region actually feel and think about this area they know and love so well.

Mr. CANNON. In just a moment we are going to yield again to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) to sort of explore what the meaning of the size of the disturbance is here.

Let me just say to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) that his discussion about alternative fuel is important. We actually have a chart here that shows at the highest expectation of alternative fuels, it does not get us very far in the foreseeable future, but in addition to that, let me just say that I firmly believe that people who are local have an understanding of what their environment is, and they have a terrific interest in maintaining it.

We have had this problem in Utah where we have ranchers who care enormously for the land, and we have had outsiders who said, No more moo in 1992, trying to get rid of all cattle grazing in 1992, for instance.

□ 2145

And it turns out we find now that the cattle grazing is remarkably important for the health of the land. So locals have a tendency, since they are responsible for it, since they interact with it, they are more reliable in how they operate and work on their lands.

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman one more time, and if I could reiterate what the gentleman from Arizona started by just pointing out that this entire refuge is about the size of South Carolina. The only area we are talking about is the area in green, which from the beginning was set aside for the purpose of oil exploration. That was part of the common sense approach we had when we preserved this land.

The only part we are talking about, as he so brilliantly put it, and the closeness of the original pipeline, is this small little red dot. That is the entire area. If we view the second shot, we can see that that small dot is only about 2,000 acres. That is the footprint, which is smaller than Dulles Airport, which services Washington, D.C. The amount of area we are talking about is less than what is Dulles Airport compared to the size of the State of South Carolina.

And as the gentleman from Arizona said, this could be a significant find in giving us domestic security with the domestic source of energy we need. And as we see by this particular chart, the amount of oil that is recoverable in the ANWR area is second only to what we receive from Saudi Arabia. If we want to eventually solve problems in the future and have some kind of independence with a domestic source of energy, this is a significant piece of the puzzle.

Mr. CANNON. Reclaiming my time for a moment, Mr. Speaker. Everybody in America knows we are struggling. We are paying a lot higher prices for our gas. That really bugs me personally.

If we go over there four or five points, and if the camera will focus on that chart, we see the red piece there. That is the amount of oil that we get from Iraq, and that looks to me like it is less than a third of the amount of oil that we would get daily from this new area in ANWR. Am I reading that correctly?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. The gentleman is correct. Iraq plays almost an insignificant role in the energy sources for the United States. But the other countries that we have here, Saudi Arabia, Canada, Mexico, and especially Venezuela, they are key elements in our foreign policy dependency. When changes take place there, when problems develop in those countries, we receive the brunt of it with higher costs for utilities, higher costs for gasoline.

Mr. CANNON. If I have what the gentleman is saying, and again focusing the camera on that chart, ANWR produces almost as much gas or oil as Saudi Arabia does. The next largest importer of gas or oil to the United States is Canada, and that would be about the same amount we would bring in from ANWR. And then the next largest exporter of oil and gas to America would be Mexico, and that is a little less than the amount of gas that we would bring down from ANWR if we did that drilling. And then the next largest supplier, which is significantly less than what we would get out of ANWR, is Venezuela.

Now, of course, part of our problems today, and I should not blame this all on the war in Iraq, because Venezuela has had its problems in recent times, but we can replace virtually any one of those suppliers with just the oil we get out of ANWR.

And when we get to the next step, we drop way down on that chart, to the point where Nigeria is only giving us a quarter, or a third of the oil that we would get from ANWR.

So ANWR represents a pretty huge step in energy independence in America. Is that what I am seeing here?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. The gentleman is correct. And these are once again what we assume to be the average daily oil productions in these areas.

The gentleman is correct in pointing out how much we receive from Canada. If my colleagues would simply note what the Canadians are doing in providing that oil is simply the area on the other side of this region that we want. That is the production lines that they are having. They understand the purpose of it. And the Canadians are able to use modern technology to produce the oil and not to spoil the environment. It does not have to be one

or the other, where we either have the energy source or we have the environment. We can have them both. We have the technology to make it possible to protect our environment and protect a domestic energy source at the same time.

Mr. RENZI. If the gentleman will yield, he makes a great point about the environment. I think in our argument we need to point out some of the truths about the environment. Seeing that I was there 3 days ago, I would like to describe for my colleagues exactly what is there. And I would like to use the words from a letter that I received while there during the hearing.

First of all, the environment when I was there was about 20 below. And we are dealing for miles and miles, as far as the eye can see, with a vast, sheer flow and flat surface. This is not mountains and streams and brooks and riparian areas. This is not sensitive areas where the musk oxen are hiding out of the wind, as we have seen on some of the environmental videos. This is a flat, frozen area.

Let me take the words from Herman Aishanna. He is a whaling captain and serves on the Kaktovik City Council. He is the former Mayor of Kaktovik. These are his words, not mine. ''For any who think they can make this rich and fully peopled country of the Kaktovik into a wilderness, they should be aware not only that we the living are here, but also that the spirits of our people since the time immemorial are here. No matter how blind, no matter what anyone wants to call it, this country is hardly a wilderness and it will never be a wilderness. This country has a people and today you are looking right at them.''

Now, he gave us this letter as a welcoming letter but also as a warning. He does not want to be locked out by some sort of environmentally imposed wilderness status, particularly given the sheer vast areas that his people inhabit, the habitat of his people. Now, this man is a leader in his community, and he very much has reached a point, and again and I would like to reiterate, where he is tired of going to hearings time and time again all the way down in Anchorage, Alaska, traveling down there with his people. He says, ''We know that they do not listen because they do things we told them not to do. We know they do not listen to us because we see them telling people how we feel about this, and they get it all wrong.''

Again, a good leader in his community frustrated with the idea that we would create a wilderness area at ANWR, lock his people out from using the snowmobile machines, lock out the ability to use the airplanes for hunting, lock it up and set it away without him being able and his people being able to go into the lands and draw out the natural resources.

Mr. CANNON. I could not help thinking, while the gentleman was talking, that the former mayor sounds like a very articulate, thoughtful guy. And if he figures out people in Washington do not listen to him, he is probably pretty smart too.

But as I listened to what the gentleman was saying, I call to mind an article that was printed about a year ago in the Atlanta Monthly which challenges the notion that the people in the Americas were savages when Columbus arrived. In fact, frankly it was suggested that the populations of Native Americans were much higher. And one of the points the article makes is that the Amazon jungle, which has very, very limited soil, is actually an artifact of man. In other words, we had millions of people living in that area and they created the jungle as people who were taking charge and being aware of their environment.

It seems to me that many of the environmentalists are actually racists. They think that they have got the ideas and that man should not be involved and that we should go back to the way the Native Americans were when we got here, ignoring the possibility that there may have been 100 times as many Native Americans in the Americas when Columbus arrived. The article suggested that the antibody systems of the Indians in America were so similar that diseases came in and decimated them, nearly knocked out 98 percent of the people in the Americas. So, naturally, they did not seem to have the kinds of cultural achievements that were apparent, say for instance from the 2 million acres of terrace lands in Peru.

But it occurs to me that people who assume that they, the Native Americans, did it all wrong or did something else other than what we are doing is a pretty narrow and racist view of those folks. And it seems to me that we are doing exactly the same thing when we decide in Washington, we who have never been to that area and have never talked to those people, that we know best for them what should happen in that area and on land that they love and that they feel a kindred spirit for or feel close to because of their ancestors and the spirits of their ancestors who have been there prior to them.

That is a pretty important point the gentleman is making.

Mr. RENZI. The gentleman is so correct. One of the points that came up during our hearing was that the impact that the good Eskimo people have made on the land is an impact that they desire. There is a philosophy that they have that the earth was given to them as a gift; that the earth was given to them to use and draw out the resources.

So the day that the generations long ago showed up on that coastal plain, the first day they killed the first whale, they believed the creator gave that to them to feed them, to clothe them. That first day they made an impact, and to this day they impact the environment. They want to be able to control their own destiny. They want to work with a sound environmental policy with an energy company who has been a proven neighbor to them in order for them to gain the benefits of the earth.

It is really a beautiful holistic approach to the land.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it sounds sort of like what we in America might call a stewardship.

Mr. RENZI. It is very similar to our stewardships.

Mr. CANNON. Since the gentleman was just there, let me ask him a couple more questions. In the first place, my understanding is that where we have had the transAlaska pipeline, and where we have drilled, the caribou herds have increased significantly; is that correct?

Mr. RENZI. There was discussion during our hearing that the caribou herd actually uses the pipeline structure as a wind sheer or as a warming element to help them in their mating process.

Mr. CANNON. Warm mating is always better than cold mating, I suspect.

Mr. RENZI. I agree. But in essence there are two caribou herds. There are a lot of people who talk about the porcupine caribou herd, whose numbers are about stable; and then there is the coastal plain caribou herd, whose numbers have grown exponentially over the years. So all the research and science shows that there has been no significant impact on the caribou herds and, in essence, the caribou have grown in population.

Mr. CANNON. Let me ask one other question, because the gentleman has been there recently, and he said it was 20 degrees below zero.

My understanding is you drill in the wintertime there. You create an ice sheet and then drill down through that sheet, so that when you finish drilling and have the equipment gone, when the springtime comes the ice sheet melts and it is like it was never there in the first place. And, in addition, you only have a little bit of a box that protrudes where the oil goes through.

Mr. RENZI. That is correct. One of the arguments that we are hearing is that the old oil technology, that old dark industry of the past, is going to ruin the environment. And it is a falsehood to think that new technology and lessons learned from the past are not going to be used. The language requires, absolutely requires that the newest and best technology of our oil industry, the American oil industry, be used at ANWR.

The gentleman from Utah talked about the ice roads. What we are going to do when we go into ANWR, if we are allowed to drill, if we are allowed to remove those resources and provide for the energy needs of our country, we will build a frozen sheet of ice, many feet thick, in order for the tractors and the vehicles to move in on. So that when in the springtime the ice melts, there will be no impact to the tundra.

Absolutely none other than the small areas where the oil is actually extracted.

But that small impact has got to be weighed in balance, in a rational balance, with the needs of this Nation and the security of this Nation.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, and I think the gentleman from Utah is now going to shift to some charts that actually gives us a sense of the proportions that are involved. Does the gentleman have the chart that shows Alaska as part of the United States? Because if I could ask the gentleman a few questions.

Alaska appears to me to be about a third of the land mass of the United States. And then we have that little yellow area up there that represents ANWR essentially.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. That is ANWR, yes.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman have the chart that shows what portion of ANWR we would have drilling in?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. And if we could focus the camera on that, we would appreciate it.

So we have all of Alaska, representing about a third of the land mass of the United States. We have ANWR, which represents the little green peace, which expanded out indicates what is ANWR and then what would be the coastal plain. That coastal plain is tiny in comparison to Alaska, and the gentleman is actually touching that dot there, if the camera is focusing there at the top of his finger, a little tiny dot which represents the ANWR footprint, and down below there is a little square that represents about 2,000 acres.

That is how much land we are going to disturb; is that about right?

Mr. RENZI. That is correct.

□ 2200

We flew over the entire area, and the plane ride itself took just a matter of minutes, and we were in a prop.

Mr. CANNON. And that was for the coastal plane?

Mr. RENZI. That was for the coastal plane, the entire strip in the north.

Mr. CANNON. If I am reading this chart correctly, we have Dulles Airport, and I am not sure we understand what is going on in Alaska, but most Members of Congress know Dulles Airport, and that is a total of 13,000 acres. So ANWR is less than a sixth. The area that would be disturbed in ANWR for drilling is less than a sixth of the size of Dulles Airport. It is all right for us to have an airport and mess up 13,000 acres of trees, but we cannot let the people of Alaska or the people in the coastal area have a couple thousand acres that would develop jobs and energy for America that would displace 4 times over our dependence of oil on Iraq. That seems to me to be a no-brainer.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, in reading the letter of the mayor, it clearly illustrated what we sadly lack here in Congress, a common sense solution balancing the needs of the future and today with the heritage that is already there. They know it, they understand it. Using technology, they are ready to move forward if we just allow them the tools to do it, and they all can win. It does not have to be a lose/lose situation. It is a win/win. They understand that, and we need to gain that same insight.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON), and then I will speak about oil and gas and we will conclude at that point.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I come from Pennsylvania where the first oil well was drilled. I live 5 miles from Drake's well. When we discovered oil in Pennsylvania, it changed the world. The whole industrial world as we know it today came about when oil became one of our energy sources. Since then, many energy sources have been added.

What do we need? Do we need ANWR, you bet. Do we need to open a lot of the west and other parts of this country that are locked up to oil and gas drilling, you bet. I am going to try to explain why. When we look at the consumption figures for the world, 39 percent of the energy used in the world is oil. And of our oil, 60 percent of that comes from unstable, unfriendly countries. That is certainly not a good position for a country like the United States to be in.

Mr. Speaker, 23 percent of our energy in the world comes from natural gas, and 23 percent of the energy that fuels the world comes from coal. Now when we add those three items together, that means 85 percent of the energy consumed in the world is fossil fuel. That is an alarming figure when we think about it. Eight percent of the energy consumed in the world is nuclear. Now we are up to 93 percent of our energy. That leaves 7 percent renewables. I support renewables every way we can support them. We need to do more hydro, we need to do more wood and biomass, ethanol, and wind solar. But when we look at the figures a little further, hydro is 3.2 percent so now we are at 96.2 percent of the world's energy. And when we add wood and biomass, we are now at 99.4 percent of the energy in the world.

I have been in so many hearings where people say if we would just stop holding back wind and solar, they would solve our problems. Wind and solar collectively is 6–10ths of 1 percent of the energy of the world. Am I for wind and solar, you bet. A company in my district has just developed some technical engineering that will help wind be far more efficient because it will automatically position the wind turbines so they face the wind properly. As the wind changes, they change. It adds to their efficiency. I am very proud of them for that. But the problem with wind is that it is only really available in a few parts of the world. Often those areas are far from transmission lines, and the wind only blows 38 percent of the time. The rest of the time we have to have a redundant source to take the place of the wind that is not blowing.

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, when I grew up in Arizona, so many people were talking about wind as being the next technology. So many people were implying that the wind energy that we receive would be cost efficient. Now I am hearing they want us to take down the windmills because it ruins the view shed.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. The volume of wind turbines needed to supply a State like Pennsylvania would cover half of New England. The other part is that is not where the wind blows. In Pennsylvania they have found two places, up in the north central part of the State in my district and in the south central part of Pennsylvania. There are two areas where the wind is the best, and they have developed a wind farm at one and are talking about a wind farm at the other. Where the wind blows best in the far reaches of Texas where there are no transmission lines to get it out.

With solar, there are only a few places in the country where solar is regular, and there is no solar power at night, and the few parts of the country that have the majority of the solar available are in places where there are no transmission lines. If we double wind and solar in a 5-year period, we would be 1.2 percent of the energy needs of the world.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, Members can see on this chart that we have the biggest amount of use of energy being petroleum. Natural gas is second; coal third; nuclear, unless we do something significant there, and I remind Members of the fact that we have dozens of nuclear reactors on battle ships, on aircraft carriers and on submarines that have been operating for 30 or 40 more years without an accident, and they have been run by 18 year olds. We know a lot about nuclear, and we are going to have to come back and consider that.

To the gentleman's point on hydropower, we have dammed all of the rivers that we are going to be able to dam. We will not have alternative power from hydropower. What we see is even if we doubled what we are anticipating, it would be irrelevant. We are not going to be able to do much with the huge increases in demand that we have in the future based on renewables. This is a graphic form to show what the gentleman is showing.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, what we need for the sake of our economy is we need reliable supplies of all energies, and we need to prevent spikes. The spikes from 2 years ago started us back into a recession. The spikes this winter are going to

slow down our economy further. The one energy that is the greatest concern right now is natural gas. Many years ago in the last administration there was a decision made that coal was out and gas was in for electric generation. I personally am not a big fan of gas for electric generation. We used it for peaking power because I believe it has been the main source of home heating, commercial, and the main source for our industry, and it should be the main source for bus fleets and truck fleets in our city areas where we need clean air. The easiest conversion away from petroleum is natural gas for our transportation fleet. In my view, that would be a better use.

But what has happened in this country in just a few years, natural gas, not generally used for power generation for making electricity, now the gas being used in this country, 13 percent of the gas is for power generation; 14 percent of the gas fuels all of commercial in this country. So power generation has caught up with commercial in a 5 or 6-year period, and every day they are hooking up new power generation plants, and the rig counts in this country to produce the gas are not there. It is interesting, and I have a map here. I wish I had a blow-up of it. The dark blue on the map is where the energy is locked up.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, if the camera will focus, this is it.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Around the Great Lakes, this Congress voted not to allow slant drilling under the Great Lakes, yet we are buying gas and oil from Canada who is drilling under our Great Lakes and selling us the product. It does not make much sense. But if natural gas is the new fuel for electricity and we want to keep it reasonable for home heating and we want to keep it reasonable for commerce and reasonable for our manufacturing and industries, we have got to have a greater supply of it. We cannot import natural gas.

A lot of people think we import natural gas from Mexico. Actually we buy some from them, but we sell more than we buy, so we are actually an exporter to Mexico. We do buy considerable natural gas from Canada, but about 86 percent of our natural gas that we use in this country comes from America, and our source and supply is dwindling because we as a Congress have locked most of those spots up, and some that are not on there, saying we cannot drill there.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this map shows that. We have some pretty significant reserves off the coast of California, the West Coast, and off the East Coast. But the yellow or orange sticker underneath here points out that 100 percent off the coast on either side of the map are tied up. We cannot tap that.

We have a pretty sizable reserve down in the Gulf of Mexico, but 56 percent of that is off limits, we cannot tap that. There are other areas, and I will point out the gentleman is correct, there is a great deal of gas under the Great Lakes where we are not now drilling and have prohibited ourselves from drilling, and so that leaves the bulk of the gas that we are going to use to heat homes. And somebody said 95 percent of our new generating capacity is gas, and it is gas because people say it is clean and we can get away with it environmentally. But where is the gas going to come from? Texas, which is a big producer of oil and gas, is building just gas generators. They are not going to export any gas in the future because they are going to run their own generators in Texas with that gas.

Unless we take that 40 percent locked up now and make that available and make the rest reasonably available in the near mountain west, we are not going to have gas to heat our homes and to generate this huge amount of new power that we are going to be generating with gas-run turbines in America.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in my district there are a number of caverns that are used to store gas for the New England area and the northeast. There are huge salt caverns that we pump the gas into in the summertime. The underground gas reserves in America are the lowest they have ever been historically. The concern is that with the amount of gas that we are using ongoing now to generate electricity, there is not going to be enough to fill them this summer. Last September we had the biggest, the largest amount of gas we ever had in this country. By late November, we had those reserves almost all used because we had an early winter and a cold winter all up and down the East Coast, and so we used more gas than usual.

The problem is right now the average gas price is somewhere between 5 and 5.50 a thousand. We were used to in this country $2 and $3 gas. It was $3 during the peak season in the winter, $2 in the summer when they would fill the reserves. We are now looking at filling reserves at $5 gas if we had it to put there, or $6 gas. When we raise the cost of doing business that much, double energy prices and more than double for large businesses that use a lot of gas, we will put them out of business.

Mr. CANNON. My understanding is that we have actually quadrupled.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. It was at 19 at one point.

Mr. CANNON. Just in the last month we have been up to 19, so that reflects a lack of reserve. The gentleman said the reserves are at the lowest level ever. Reserves are a function of what we know is there.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. No, the reserves I am speaking about are the caverns where we store storage gas. Not reserves. There are a lot of reserves in this country, but a lot of them are under those orange areas where we cannot drill.

Mr. CANNON. Reserves are a function of what we learn through science, and so reserves of oil and gas have gone up dramatically. We know that we had oil and gas in the ground at different places, and we did not have the technology to get it out, and so we did not count that as a recoverable reserve. We now have technologies that will get a lot more of that out, so our recoverable reserves have gone up on that basis, and also on the basis that we have explored more so we have found new reserves. So we have a couple of dynamics there.

But those reserves are discounted by what we can reasonably legally get to. I suspect, in fact, we are at an all-time low, as reflected in the high price of oil and gas, with the reserves that we have access to today not because we have limited them or we have not discovered more, but because we have taken those reserves that we have and we have legally limited access to those reserves.

□ 2215

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. That is correct. And if we do not up the drilling in this country, because we are only importing a small part from Canada, and then we import 4 or 5 percent of liquid natural gas, but we only have two places, one in Louisiana and I think one in New Jersey, where ships with liquid natural gas can come here. They liquefy it in other countries, bring it here and then put it back into gas form in the pipelines, and it is used, whether in our homes or commercially or business.

So we do not really have the options of importing gas like we do oil. You have to have a pipeline, and the only place the potential is up through Canada to ANWR. Now, ANWR is a huge gas supply. The ANWR field has tremendous volumes, but it is going to cost a lot of money and it is going to take years to build a pipeline to get that gas down to us.

But the problem we face in this country I do not think a lot of people are looking at. I have been watching it for 3 years as we started hooking up power generation plants. You can talk about an 18, 20, 24 inch high pressure gas line sucking gas out of our system. That heats a lot of homes.

This year we had very high home heating prices. Next winter they are going to be much higher, because there is really no solution to the problem. Everybody all of a sudden is panicking because the gas supply is much lower than they ever anticipated, and since global warming sort of left us out this winter and we have cold weather in April in Washington, we are using gas at an unprecedented rate now, so they are still drawing out of the underground storage, and there is going to be nothing in storage, and if we fill, we are going to be filling at very high prices, which are now $5 to $6 dollars a thousand.

Mr. CANNON. I would say to the gentlemen we have about 10 minutes left in this hour. It has gone quickly. I think which had some interesting information here. I would like to talk for

about 3 minutes about the situation with oil and gas and other energy resources with some charts, and then I would like to let everyone take a couple of minutes to make some final comments.

If I can put these back up, if the camera would focus on those charts, we looked at this, and just let me briefly reiterate, we are going to use a lot more oil and gas and other energy. Some of those are limited. There are no more rivers that we are going to go hydropower on. In fact, we are going to get rid of some of the dams I think over time that we are using for hydropower. The non-hydro renewables, even if you quadrupled the amount of growth we are dealing with here, are not going to be significant in the next 20 or so years.

Nuclear could do something new and different, it could be very helpful in this process, but we are going to have to come to understand nuclear and the safety of nuclear.

Now, if you look at this chart, there are a couple of things that are really interesting about it. In the first place, you note in the seventies and early eighties, we actually had a decline in energy or oil usage. That happened for a lot of reasons. We had a slight recession back then. We also got cars more efficient. But, most importantly of all, we had businesses that had an incentive to be more efficient. So in virtually all areas you had a little bit of improvement in efficiency there.

Then we have gone up, if you see the line in the middle that shows the year 2000, essentially the present, we have gone from that nadir back up a little bit. While that energy has increased, let me just point out that our economy has almost doubled, so we have had a huge increase in output in our economy with a relatively small increase in energy.

But we have gotten a lot of those efficiencies out, and maybe we'll have more in future, but we now have a pretty good idea where we are going to go as the economy continues to grow and we have more demand for energy.

If we can focus on that chart, this is just the energy we use for the generation of power. So you note that the major source of power is from coal. The second major, historically, has been nuclear, which is now level. But you can see that green line of natural gas just spiking up. That is going to spike up because in America we have decided to use natural gas because it is easier to permit new generating facilities with gas than with coal, although we expect more coal generation over time. So we are going to have a big increase in natural gas for electricity generation.

But if you look at the chart, this chart now, this chart is about what percentage of homes are heated with various sources of energy. When you have got a little bit of blue in here developed by electricity, you see that is fairly constant over time. That is also generated increasingly by natural gas. But the vast majority of American homes are going to be heated by gas.

Owning a home is good. We just had a study that was released this last week that indicated the way kids do better in school is by living in a home with their families, as opposed to an apartment or other circumstances. The American dream is to own a home. We are going to heat our homes with natural gas. We need natural gas to do that.

That gets us back to our last chart. The bulk of the gas we are going to be using in America in the future is going to be in the inter-mountain west, and to get that gas we have to drill and we have to change the legal structure that allows us to drill there.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we need obviously a comprehensive energy policy. Fortunately, we are going to have the opportunity very soon on this floor to vote on a common sense approach that provides balance by using local ideas and technology to provide for our energy needs as well as protect our environment.

But the question I have, especially if you go back to the chart that you just placed down there on the ground which shows where the future is, if we turn our back on this comprehensive energy policy, if we do not provide this kind of balance, looking at how homes are being heated right now, what is the future for my kids? What is going to be their future as they go out and try to develop their own homes, if we do not do something with the comprehensive energy policy now?

Mr. CANNON. They are either going to be cold, and we know what happens to caribou when they are not warm. If you recall earlier, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) pointed out that the heat from the pipeline has increased the number significantly. Or they are going to be paying an arm and leg for heat in their homes. And that is, I do not think, an acceptable alternative.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI).

Mr. RENZI. I will be quick. I would like my last statement to go back and reiterate what I saw during the last 3 days when I was up there in ANWR. I would like to go back and let the American people know what the people in Kaktovik really want. I spoke about my 81-year-old elder friend, the whaling captain. I spoke about the mayors and city councilmen.

Let me speak about a young woman named Morgan who is the student body president of the high school, who wrote a letter. She started off by thanking us for coming to her village.

She said, ''Personally I think that ANWR should be opened, because I think that we as a community would benefit greatly from it.''

She says, ''I support the decision that we, the Kaktovik people, need to be involved, because it is us who knows best, us who knows best how to use the land. It is also important that other people from around the country, as well as yourselves in Congress, know that we are a community that uses the land around us for everyday purposes, that we care just as much about what happens and only want to see the best.''

Finally, here it is: ''It is our responsibility to look out for what is in the best interests of our community, rather than a person who is trying to take it over and not make it ours.''

What Morgan is talking about is the idea that rather than work together and solve the energy needs of America by environmentally sound methods, extracting the oil and the energy from ANWR, that we would pass a bill, a different bill than our energy bill, that would create a wilderness area, would lock out the people of Kaktovik, would lock it out for their food and resource needs, as well as the needs and the oil that lies underneath their very feet.

I thank the gentleman for the time tonight and the ability to communicate the needs of the Kaktovik people to the American people tonight.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the gentleman, and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP). We appreciate their contributions tonight. As members of the Western Caucus, we thank them for being here.

I yield the last couple of minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) to wrap up for the evening.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very vital that we pass an energy bill in this Congress and pass one that is meaningful. We must continue to improve efficiency and conservation of our energy use. I think in electricity we need to veer away from natural gas and go back to clean coal and nuclear for the interim, because if we continue to use natural gas as we are, we are going to threaten home heating. Gas should be saved for affordable home heating, commercial, industrial, and should be used for mass transit in our cities, which would help clean air there.

Oil should be replaced in transportation as quick as we can, whether it is hydrogen fuel cells, the new cars that use multi-fuels or whatever, because we only have 2.5 percent of the world's oil and basically our transportation is funded with oil, and we do not have a long term source of oil.

We need reliable supplies of all energy sources to prevent the price spikes. Why do I say that? Every time we have energy spikes in our country, we have a downturn in our economy and millions of Americans lose their jobs. Seventy percent of our economy is commerce, and when you take money out of home heating budgets, if home heating prices double, when transportation prices for driving our cars spike at the same time, all of that spending comes out of commerce. People do not go and shop, people do not go and spend money, because they have already paid it to their energy sources.

It is vital for the business future of this country, for the home heating efficiency of this country, for an economy that is reliable, we need reliable supplies of all kinds of energy. It will not be easy. We are going to have to do a lot of things differently than we are today. We will have to change a lot of our priorities. It is vital to the future of this country.

If there is one thing in my view that threatens the economic future of America, it is the lack of reliable, affordable energy prices that our businesses and our homes and people can use to fuel their homes and our businesses. Without that, our economy will be very difficult.

ENERGY CHALLENGES FACING AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for one-half the time remaining until midnight, or approximately 40 minutes.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor tonight to talk about the energy challenges facing America and the opportunities that we now have before America and to advise the House that this afternoon, along with support of about 40 Members of the U.S. House, I introduced an amendment to the underlying energy bill which could be on the floor tomorrow that would give America a new Apollo Energy Project that would give America an energy program that is befitting the boldness and can-do spirit of this country. I will come back, in a moment, to explain why it is called the Apollo Energy Project.

Before I do, I thought I should address what the challenges are to America and our energy world. They are three. They are really quite obvious, and I think that they are well understood by Americans and accepted by Americans on a consensus basis.

Challenge number one: Our Nation has an addiction.

We are addicted to oil from the Mideast. We are addicted to oil from one of the most turbulent, incendiary, dangerous parts of the planet in the last couple of centuries. This addiction, in all administrations, Democrat and Republican, has resulted in a foreign policy not to the security interests of America and not to the interests of spreading democracy in the Middle East.

Americans understand that, both in their head and in their gut, because they know that the policies, for instance, in Majlis, in the Saudi Arabian Royal House, is they have refused to cooperate fully in the war on terrorism and in fact have allowed certain elements in their society to support terrorism without cracking down on it. Americans understand that the reason for that is because of our addiction to Middle Eastern oil, and they realize that our foreign policy has been tainted, has been poisoned, by this addiction. And Americans understand that breaking that addiction perhaps is job number one for an energy policy of America. That is the first challenge.

The second challenge is to deal with the phenomena of global warming. Americans now have come to understand overwhelmingly that when we place into the atmosphere pollutants from our burning of fossil fuels, by necessity these pollutants have caused a huge proliferation of global gas emissions to increase the rate of these gasses that warm the planet and the atmosphere.

Americans know if we are going to continue to burn fossil fuels without using new technologies to trap these pollutants, we are going to continue to increase the increase of carbon dioxide and methane and other global warming gasses in the atmosphere. Americans know if we do that, that these gasses are sort of like a blanket, they trap infrared radiation escaping the Earth and will be warming the planet for the next century.

Americans are concerned when they see what has happened as a result of global warming already. They know that in Glacier National Park, where we had 150 glaciers about 100 years ago, we now have 50, and we are projected to have no glaciers, no glaciers, in Glacier National Park in the next century if trends continue. We will have to rename it ''Puddle Natural Park'' I suppose.

Americans have seen the melting of the polar ice caps, the reduction by 10 percent in breadth and 40 percent in depth of the arctic ice cap; the melting of tundra in Alaska, where dead Indians are popping up out of graveyards because the tundra has melted.

□ 2230

We have seen the extraordinary increase in dangerous weather in the continental United States that is associated or could be associated with this phenomenon. We know that we have a responsibility to our children to stop our proliferation and contribution of these global warming gases and that we can do so. That is the second challenge.

The third challenge is an economic one, and the challenge is that we know that technologies always are continuing to grow, and we know that because of this challenge in the Mideast with oil and because of global warming, people are going to want new technologies for new sources of energy. The problem is that we have kind of a gap, we have a technology gap, because we are losing jobs right now in the new energy technologies to Germany for solar, as Germany now is the leading solar manufacturer of solar chips; to Japan with hybrid vehicles, as Japan is now leading us in the production of fuel-efficient vehicles; and to Denmark, a small European country that now is leading the world in the production of wind turbines, and these are jobs that belong right here in the United States, not to be lost to our economic competitors. We have a job loss phenomenon because we do not have an energy policy that is forward-thinking. We have an energy policy that looks backwards.

Well, today, Mr. Speaker, we offered an amendment for a new, bold, visionary energy policy, and we call it the New Apollo Energy Project. We did that, inspired by a former member of the U.S. Congress who, on May 9, 1951, walked down this aisle right here and he walked up to the platform and addressed a joint session of the U.S. Congress of the United States. That night, John F. Kennedy challenged America to go to the moon within 10 years and bring that man back safely to earth. At the time, he challenged America to exercise its can-do spirit. People thought that was a little bit nuts, to send, at the time they were thinking of a man, to the moon and bring him back within 10 years. That idea stunned people at the precursor of NASA thinking, how the heck are we going to do that?

But John Kennedy knew something about the character of America. He knew that when Americans recognized a challenge and were rallied to a cause, they could produce like no culture in human history, and this American culture responded with technological innovations which led the world in using our can-do spirit to create new devices, new software, new computers, new rockets, new navigational systems, new satellites that were unheard of before John Kennedy asked America to accept that challenge.

That is exactly the type of challenge which we need to give to America tomorrow when we adopt an energy policy.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I have, along with my colleagues, offered this New Apollo Energy Project is because unfortunately, the underlying bill that we seek to amend is timid, it is slow, it is too little, it is too late, and it is a package deserving of some country less than America, because it fails to cut the mustard in dealing with the 3 fundamental challenges of energy that this country is facing.

Number 1, it fails to give America any hope whatsoever to break that addiction to middle eastern oil. Second, it fails to give America any hope that it is going to deal successfully with this challenge of global warming. Third, it fails to give America any hope that we are going to bring those jobs back to America that now are going across the waters to countries that recognize, are recognizing these new potentially job-creating economies.

So we have introduced this New Apollo Energy Project to introduce those 3 challenges.

I want to discuss the difference between this proposal, which we would be proposing at this moment by Democratic Members of the House, and we hope that Republicans will join us tomorrow or the next day when this bill